IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JOSEPH JADCZAK and CATHERIN	Ε)
JADCZAK,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
)
V.) C.A. No.
)
HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPAN	Υ,)
)
Defendant.)

NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1441(b) (DIVERSITY)

TO: THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CLERK FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE:

Please take notice that Defendant, Homesite Insurance Company ("Homesite"), hereby removes to this Court from the Superior Court of the State of Delaware in and for Sussex County the state court action described below and states as follows:

- 1. On May 25, 2007, an action was commenced in the Superior Court of the State of Delaware in and for Sussex County, C.A. No. 07C-05-030 ESB. A copy of the Complaint for Declaratory and Other Relief is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."
- 2. A Summons was issued by the Prothonotary on May 25, 2007 and subsequently served upon Matthew Denn, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Delaware on June 12, 2007. Copies of the Summons and Sheriff's Return are attached hereto as Exhibit "B." Homesite was subsequently served on June 18, 2007.
- 3. This action is a civil action of which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1332 because it is a dispute between citizens of this state and a citizen of a foreign state

and because the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

- 4. Homesite is a Connecticut corporation with its principal place of business in Boston, Massachusetts.
- 5. This filing of the Notice of Removal is made within thirty (30) days after Homesite received notice of the Complaint.

Dated: July 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

OZENO CONNOR

Sean J. Bellew (No. 4072) Chase Manhattan Centre 1201 N. Market Street, Suite 1400

Wilmington, DE 19801 Telephone: (302) 295-2000 Facsimile: (302) 295-2013

Attorneys for Defendant, Homesite Insurance Company EFiled: May 25 2007 3:36 EDT
Transaction ID 15018570
Case No. 07C-05-030 ESB

IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY

JOSEPH JADCZAK and CATHERINE JADCZAK,)
Plaintiffs,	
,	C.A. No.
V.	NON-ARBITRATION
HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPANY,)) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant	j

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND OTHER RELIEF

Nature of the Action

- 1. This is an action seeking recovery of compensatory and punitive damages, declaratory relief, and other relief arising from defendant Homesite Insurance Company's breach of contract, bad faith breach of contract, and otherwise wrongful refusal to honor its contractual obligations under a certain policy of first-party property insurance issued to plaintiffs by defendant.
- 2. This action seeks, *inter alia*, a declaration that plaintiffs are entitled to full reimbursement of the cost of rebuilding a structure located on plaintiffs' residence premises in Milton, Sussex County, Delaware which was destroyed by a fire, and that plaintiffs are entitled to full payment (less depreciation) for property destroyed in the aforementioned fire.

The Parties

- 3. Plaintiffs are husband and wife and reside at 29555 Eagles Crest Drive, Milton, Delaware 19968.
- 4. Defendant is an insurance carrier domiciled in Boston, Massachusetts and duly authorized to transact business in the State of Delaware. Pursuant to 18 Del. C. § 525(a), it may

be served by serving process upon the Honorable Matthew P. Denn, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Delaware.

The Insurance Contract

- 5. At all times relevant herein, plaintiffs were the owners in fee simple of a parcel of land at the "Eagles Crest" subdivision, located at 29555 Eagles Crest Drive, Milton, Sussex County, Delaware 19968.
- 6. At all times relevant herein, plaintiffs were the named insureds under a contract of insurance issued by defendant under policy number 30318103 with effective dates of August 16, 2005 to August 16, 2006 ("the Policy").
- 7. The Policy afforded first-party property-damage coverage to plaintiffs under "Section I Property" with the following limits:

Coverage A – Dwelling \$622,000.00

Coverage B – Other Structures \$62,200.00

Coverage C – Personal Property \$435,400.00

Coverage D – Loss of Use \$124,400.00

- 8. The Policy declarations indicate that the "Insured Location" of the Policy is "29555 Eagles Crest Road, Milton, DE 19968-3621
 - The Policy declarations, under "Description of Dwelling", state:
 2000 Clapboard structure, Single family home, Primary residence, Partially Protected, territory code 0002, over 1000ft, from hydrant,
- 8. Under the "Definitions" section of the Policy, the following definitions may be found:
 - (a) 4. "Insured location" means:

within 5 miles from fire station.

a. The "residence premises";

- b. The part of other premises, other structures and grounds used by you as a residence and:
 - Which is shown in the Declarations; **(1)**
 - Which is acquired by you during the (2) policy period for your use as a residence;
- Any premises used by you in connection c. with a premises in 4.a. and 4.b. above; * * *
- (b) 8. "Residence premises" means:
 - The one family dwelling, other structures, a. and grounds; or
 - b. That part of any other building;

where you reside and which is shown as the "residence premises" in the Declarations. * * *

9. Under "Section I - Property Coverages" of the Policy, defendant committed itself to insure the following under "Coverage A - Dwelling":

We cover:

- l. The dwelling on the "residence premises" shown in the Declarations, including structures attached to the Dwelling; and
- 2. Materials and supplies located on or next to the "residence premises" used to construct, alter, or repair the dwelling or other structures on the "residence premises".

· This coverage does not apply to land, including land on which the dwelling is located.

10. Under "Section I - Property Coverages" of the Policy, defendant committed itself to insure the following under "Coverage B - Other Structures":

> We cover other structures on the "residence premises" set apart from the dwelling by clear space. This includes structures connected to the dwelling by only a fence, utility line, or similar connection.

Case 1:07-cv-00431-GMS

This coverage does not apply to land, including land on which the other structures are located. * * * The limit of liability for this coverage will not be more than 10% of the limit of liability that applies to Coverage A. Use of this coverage does not reduce the Coverage A limit of liability.

11. Under "Section I - Property Coverages" of the Policy, defendant committed itself to insure the following under "Coverage C - Personal Property":

> We cover personal property owned or used by an "insured" while it is anywhere in the world. * * *

12. Under "Section I - Property Coverages" of the Policy, "Coverage C - Personal Property" contained the following language which purports to exclude certain claims under "Coverage C - Personal Property":

Property Not Covered. We do not cover:

- 3. Motor vehicles or all other motorized land conveyances. This includes:
 - Their equipment and accessories; or a.
 - b. Electronic apparatus that is designed to be operated solely by use of the power from the electrical system of motor vehicles or all other motorized land conveyances. Electronic apparatus includes:
 - (1)Accessories or antennas; or
 - **(2)** Tapes, wires, records, discs, or other media:

For use with any electronic apparatus.

The exclusion of property described in 3.a. and 3.b. above applies only while the property is in or upon the vehicle or conveyance.

We do cover vehicles or conveyances not subject to motor vehicle registration which are:

- Used to service an "insured's" residence; or a.
- b. Designed for assisting the handicapped.
- 13. Under "Section I - Property Coverages" of the Policy, defendant committed itself to insure against the following pursuant to a section entitled "Additional Coverages":
 - Reasonable repairs. In the event that covered property is damaged by an applicable Peril Insured Against, we will pay the reasonable cost incurred by you for necessary measures taken solely to protect against further damage. If the measures taken involve repair to other damaged property, we will pay for those measures only if that property is covered under this policy and the damage to the property is caused by an applicable Peril Insured Against. * * *
 - 3. Trees, Shrubs, and Other Plants. We cover trees, shrubs, plants or lawns, on the "residence premises," for loss caused by the following Perils Insured Against: Fire or lightning, Explosion, Riot or civil commotion, Aircraft, Vehicles not owned or operated by a resident of the "residence premises," Vandalism or malicious mischief or Theft.

We will pay up to 5% of the limit of liability.

The Insured Property

- 5. "Eagles Crest" is a residential airpark, wherein property owners who are also aviators live on a private airstrip. Property owners such as plaintiffs may, if they elect, build hangars in which to store their personal aircraft.
- 6. Located on plaintiffs' parcel of land was one (1) single-family residential dwelling, together with one (1) aircraft hangar ("the Hangar").
- 7. The Hangar was constructed after plaintiffs moved into their home, at which time plaintiffs equipped the Hangar with electricity, heat, running water, and sewer/septic service. Located within the Hangar were, among other things, a refrigerator, a television set, two-way radios, and a study used by plaintiff Joseph Jadczak ("Mr. Jadczak").

Case 1:07-cv-00431-GMS

- 8. Plaintiffs stored one (1) aircraft within the Hangar, together with a recreational vehicle ("the RV") and associated items.
- 9. At all times relevant herein, the RV was neither registered nor titled in Delaware or any other state, and the RV was not covered by any policies of automobile insurance.
- From time to time prior to the events giving rise to the allegations set forth in this Complaint, plaintiffs would use the RV as a spare bedroom, usually when hosting relatives, by hooking the RV up to the power, water, and sewer/septic lines located in the Hangar.

The Fire

- 10. On or about May 29, 2006, a fire occurred in the Hangar ("the Fire").
- 11. The Fire resulted in the total destruction of the hangar and its contents, including the RV, with the exception of plaintiffs' airplane, which Mr. Jadczak was able to remove from the Hangar without damage.
 - 12. The Fire also caused damage to plaintiffs' home.
- 13. Multiple fire companies responded to the Fire, which was investigated by the Delaware State Fire Marshal's Office,
 - 14. The Fire was determined to be accidental in nature.
 - 15. Plaintiffs immediately notified defendant of the Fire.
- 16. Despite being immediately notified of the Fire, defendant failed to promptly send an adjuster to the scene of the fire to obtain photographic evidence of the Fire and to preserve evidence and materials that would assist defendant in pursuing a subrogation claim. Instead, defendant sent Chap Chancellor, AIC, an independent adjuster, to meet with plaintiffs some weeks after the fire to obtain a statement of their losses, and then failed to instruct Mr. Chancellor to obtain a sworn proof of loss statement from plaintiffs.

- 17. In addition, defendant failed to retain a cause-and-origin investigator determine the nature of the Fire.
 - 18. Plaintiffs timely submitted proof of their losses to defendant.

45/29/2007 Casts 1307-cv-06481 8G\$4850R Doctions 1502

Homesite Issues a Lengthy Reservation-Of-Rights Letter

- On or about June 27, 2006, Maria Loffredo, a "Lurge Loss Specialist" employed 19. by defendant, sent plaintiffs a reservation of rights letter ("ROR Letter"). The ROR Letter contained numerous misstatements of fact and/or misrepresentations, including, but not limited to, the following:
- That the Fire was "an alleged fire", when in fact the Fire occurred and was (a) reported in several local media outlets and defendant was immediately notified of it;
- (b) That "an old battery charger" had been plugged into the RV at the time of the Fire "for at least three (3) years", when in fact the battery charger had been only plugged in overnight;
- (c) That it was "unclear" whether the Hangar was used for a business purpose, when in fact plaintiffs specifically represented to defendant and its agents, servants, and/or employees that the Hangar and its contents were used solely for personal matters;
- That the RV had been "allegedly damaged", when in fact it had been (d) totally destroyed by the Fire.
- 20. The ROR Letter further represented that defendant would provide plaintiffs "with a coverage determination upon completion of our investigation" and also requested "an additional 60 days in which to investigate" the Fire and its attendant losses. The ROR Letter further demanded that plaintiffs produce additional information and documentation to defendant in support of their claim, which plaintiffs produced.

Homesite Retains Attorneys Not Licensed in Delaware to Conduct an Examination Under Oath of Plaintiffs and to Provide Legal Opinions

- Shortly after issuing the ROR Letter, without affording plaintiffs an opportunity 21. to respond to the items requested in the ROR Letter, defendant retained the Michigan law firm of Merry, Farnan & Ryan, P.C. ("MFR") to conduct an examination under oath ("EUO") of plaintiffs and to provide legal opinions concerning defendant's obligation to plaintiffs under the Policy.
- 22. By letter dated July 7, 2006, Michael T. Ryan, Esquire of MFR-a Michigan attorney not licensed in Delaware—notified plaintiffs of his intention to take their examination under oath, and unilaterally scheduled the examination for August 21, 2006.
- 23. Attached to Ryan's letter of July 7, 2006 was a document entitled "The Rights of an Insured When Providing an Examination Under Oath." This document set forth seven purported "rights" which plaintiffs allegedly possessed in connection with their examination under oath. However, this document made no reference to either the Policy or applicable Delaware law.
 - 24. The "rights" set forth in the aforementioned document included, in pertinent part:
- "(3) An examination under eath may only be conducted upon reasonable notice, at a reasonably convenient place and for a reasonable length of time."
- "(5) The insurer shall notify the insured that, upon request and free of charge, it will provide the insured with a copy of the transcript of the proceedings and a tape of the proceedings, if one exists."
- 25. However, contrary to this listing of plaintiffs' alleged "Rights", MFR, acting at the behest of defendant, initially unilaterally scheduled plaintiffs' EUO without consulting them,

Case 1:07-cv-00431-GMS

and also failed to reimburse plaintiffs for the cost of the transcript of their EUO, despite requests to do so.

- 26. Plaintiff Joseph Jadczak's EUO was taken on October 3, 2006, after defendant, through counsel, agreed to waive plaintiff Catherine Jadczak's EUO.
- 27. The aforementioned EUO was taken by attorney Jeffrey M. Smythe, an associate attorney with MFR, who was also not licensed to practice law in Delaware.
- 28. Said EUO lasted many hours in duration and made inquiry with plaintiff Joseph Jadczak into practically each and every item of personal property which plaintiffs alleged was destroyed in the Fire.

Homesite Provides a Vague Settlement Offer in the Form of a "Sworn Statement in Proof of Loss" Without Explaining the Basis of the Offer

- 29. Despite the length and overly searching breadth of the EUO, defendant did not provide plaintiffs with any offer to pay any part of their claim until over one month later, when, on November 10, 2006, Loffredo forwarded plaintiffs' attorney a "Sworn Statement in Proof of Loss" ("POL") which required plaintiffs to release all claims against defendant in exchange for payment of the sum of \$122,116.95.
- 30, However, the various schedules on the POL forwarded by Loffredo were completely blank, and neither specified the policy forms applicable to the loss nor the items, loss amount, and actual cash value of the personal property which defendant offered to pay.
- 31. Not until plaintiffs' counsel inquired into the basis of the offer presented by defendant did Smythe provide plaintiffs' counsel with a breakdown of the amounts contained in the offer.
 - 32. Specifically, Smythe indicated that defendants' offer consisted of the following: Coverage A

Building repairs: \$ 3,584.74 Landscaping repairs: \$21,772.00 Total: \$25,356.74

Coverage B

Policy limits \$62,200.00 5% debris surcharge \$ 3,110.00 Total: \$65,310.00

Coverage C

Personal property \$45,646.89 \$14,196.68 Depreciation

"Actual cash value"

of personal property: \$31,450.22

- 33. However, at that time, neither Smythe, Loffredo, nor any other representative of defendant pr MFR indicated to plaintiffs or their counsel:
- (a) Why defendant did not afford coverage for the loss of the Hangar under Coverage A;
- (b) The basis of the calculation for its offer to reimburse plaintiffs for their destroyed personal property under Coverage C;
- (c) What, if any, claims submitted by plaintiffs were being denied, and for what reason.
- 34. In fact, plaintiffs had submitted evidence to defendant of losses totaling at least \$294,387.50 as follows:

(I)	Rebuilding hangar:	\$210,000.00
(2)	Replacement of RV:	\$24,430.00
(3)	Replacement of tow dolly:	\$1,800.00
(4)	Replacement of radios:	\$18,000.00
(5)	Replacement of cargo ramp:	\$575.00
(6)	Replacement of two-way radios:	\$18,000.00
(7)	Replacement of various other	
	personal property:	\$35,801.90
(8)	Landscaping repair:	\$21,772.00

ロコノとタノとロロイ

Case 1:07-cv-00431-GMS

36. In addition, plaintiffs submitted evidence to defendant, both in writing and at Mr. Jadczak's EUO, that plaintiffs were paying a neighbor rent in the amount of approximately \$400.00 per month to house their personal airplane until the Hangar could be rebuilt.

Document 1-2

- Yet, notwithstanding the clear proof plaintiffs provided to defendant of their 35. \$294,387.50 claim for property damage, and plaintiffs' ongoing payment of rent for their airplane, defendant failed to pay or commit itself to pay the claim.
- 36, Moreover, defendant neither accepted nor denied plaintiffs' claim, whether orally or in writing, nor did defendant ever provide a "final coverage determination" to plaintiffs, as defendant had committed to do in the June 27, 2006 ROR Letter.

COUNT I - DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

- 37. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 36 above.
- 38. Plaintiffs and defendant have been unable to agree on defendant's obligation to plaintiffs. Therefore, a case in controversy presently exists between the parties.
- 39. Plaintiffs seek a declaration from this Court pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 10 Del. C. § 6501 et seq., and SUPER. Ct. Civ. R. 57 concerning the rights and obligations of the parties to this action as follows:
- (a) Whether the Policy is sufficiently vague or ambiguous as to place plaintiffs' claim for the total loss of the Hangar within "Coverage A - Dwelling" of the Policy;
- (b) Whether the Policy is sufficiently vague or ambiguous as to place plaintiffs' claim for the total loss of the RV within "Coverage C - Personal Property" of the Policy,

- (b) Whether the Hangar constitutes an "insured location" and/or a "residence premises" under "Coverage A Dwelling" of the Policy;
- (c) Whether the RV is covered under "Coverage C Personal Property" of the Policy.
- 40. An award of declaratory relief by this Court will terminate some or all of the existing controversy between the parties.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray that this Honorable Court enter an order declaring the rights and obligations of the parties hereto.

COUNT II - DEBT/BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 41. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 40 above.
- 42. Defendant has breached the terms of the Policy by failing and refusing to honor plaintiffs' claims in whole.
- 43. Defendant has further breached the terms of the Policy by engaging in the course of conduct set forth above.
- 44. As a result of defendant's aforementioned conduct in connection with the handling and processing of plaintiffs' claim, including, but not limited to, their failure to accept and pay for the total amount of the loss of the Hangar under Coverage A of the Policy, plaintiffs have sustained financial losses, including, without limitation, securing a personal loan to finance the rebuilding of the Hangar; the unreimbursed cost of securing the transcript from Mr. Jadczak's EUO; refinancing their mortgage to secure additional funds to replace their personal property; and expending attorney's fees to vindicate their rights under the Policy.

45. Defendant is indebted to plaintiffs in the amount of at least \$172,320.54, representing the portion of their claim which was unpaid by defendants, together with approximately \$35,000.00 in closing costs for their refinancing, hangar rent, interest on the aforementioned loan, and other associated expenses.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs demand judgment in their favor in the amount of \$207,320.54, together with interest, attorney's fees pursuant to 18 Del. C. § 4102, and the costs of this action.

COUNT III - BAD FAITH

- 46. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs I through 45 above.
- 47. Defendant breached the duty of good faith and fair dealing inherent in all insurance contracts, in that it:
 - (a) Failed to timely investigate plaintiffs' property damage claim;
 - (b) Failed to assign a cause-and-origin investigator to plaintiffs' property damage claim to determine the cause of the fire and any subrogation potential;
 - (c) Issued a lengthy and vague reservation-of-rights letter which failed to place plaintiffs on notice of the reason for the dispute of their claim;
 - (d) Assigned a non-Delaware law firm to conduct an investigation under oath of plaintiffs and, upon information and belief, render a coverage opinion;
 - (e) Permitted its non-Delaware lawyers to issue a document purporting to set forth plaintiffs' "rights" concerning their examination under oath when in fact those "rights" were violated;
 - (f) Delayed the investigation of plaintiffs' claim;
 - (g) Failed to timely pay plaintiffs' claim, resulting in plaintiffs incurring significant out-of-pocket losses; and
 - (h) Otherwise committed acts constituting bad faith which will be determined in discovery.

49. As a result of defendants conduct, plaintiffs demand punitive damages to punish

plaintiffs incurred significant losses, inconvenience, and financial hardship.

and make an example of defendant to deter other similarly situated insurers from engaging in

similar conduct.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs demand judgment in their favor for general and punitive

damages, together with interest and the costs of this action.

PERRY & SENSOR

By: /s/ Michael L. Sensor

Michael L. Sensor, Esquire Delaware Bar ID No. 3541

One Customs House, Suite 560

P.O. Box 1568

Wilmington, DE 19899-1568

Telephone: (302) 655-4482

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: May 25, 2007

EFiled: May 25 2007 3:36 Transaction ID 15018570 Case No. 07C-05-030 ESB IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY		
JOSEPH JADCZAK and CATHERINE JADCZAK, Plaintiffs, v. HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant. THE STATE OF DELAWARE, TO THE SHERIFF OF KENT COUNTY:)))) C.A. No.)) NON-ARBITRATION)) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
YOU ARE COMMANDED:		
hereof upon defendant, exclusive of upon Michael L. Sensor, Esquire, pl Custome House, Suite 560, P.O. Box the complaint (and, if an affidavit defense).	t so that, within 20 days after service the day of service, defendant shall serve laintiff's attorney, whose address is One 1568, Wilmington, DE 19899, an answer to of demand has been filed, an affidavit of y hereof and of the complaint (and of the filed by plaintiff).	
Daced:	JOYCE COLLINS Prothonocary	
•		
· .	Per Deputy	
exclusive of the day of service, to an answer to the complaint (and, if affidavit of defense), judgment by	in 20 days after service hereof upon you, serve on plaintiff's attorney named above an affidavit of demand has been filed, an default will be rendered against you for (or in the affidavit of demand, if any).	
	JOYCE COLLINS Frothonotary	
	Per Deputy	

Sheriff's Return

Served the within Writ of Summons together with a copy of the Complaint upon:

HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPANY

by delivering to and leaving in the hands of **Matthew Denn**, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Delaware, true copies of the said Writ together with a copy of the plaintiff's:

SUMMONS/COMPLAINT

together with the sum of \$ 25.00 Dollars, as prescribed by Title 18 Delaware Code Section 525 this day, Tuesday, June 12, 2007.

So Answers,

Jim Higdon Sheriff of Kent County TED PROTHCHOTARY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE IN AND FOR SUSSEX COUNTY

JOSEPH JADCZAK and CATHERINE)
JADCZAK,)
71.1.100)
Plaintiffs,)
) C.A. No. 07C-05-030 ESB
)
v.) NON-ARBITRATION
HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPANY,)
•) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	,)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sean J. Bellew, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that, on this 11th day of July, 2007, a true and correct copy of the foregoing *Notice of Removal of Action Under 28 U.S.C.* §1441(b) (Diversity) was served upon counsel of record in the manner indicated:

Hand Delivery

Michael L. Sensor, Esquire Perry & Sensor One Customs House, Suite 560 Wilmington, DE 19801

Dated: July 11, 2007

COZENOCONNOR

Sean J. Bellew (No. 4072) Chase Manhattan Centre

1201 N. Market Street, Suite 1400

Wilmington, DE 19801 Telephone: (302) 295-2000 Facsimile: (302) 295-2013

Attorneys for Defendant, Homesite Insurance Company JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

RECEIPT#

AMOUNT

CIVIL COVER SHEET

07-431

MAG, JUDGE

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required we except as provided by local rules of court. This form conveyed by the Individed Conference of the Vision Con by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THIS FORM.) DEFENDANTS I. (a) PLAINTIFFS HOMESITE INSURANCE COMPANY JOSEPH JADCZAK and CATHERINE JADCZAK COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF Sussex County, Delaware (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED ATTORNEYS (If Known) (c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER) Sean J. Bellew, Cozen O'Connor, Chase Manhattan Centre, 1201 North Market Street, Miehael L. Sensor, Perry & Sensor, One Customs House, Suite 560, P.O. Box 1568, Suite 1400, Wilmington, DE 19801 Wilmington, DE 19899-1568 (302) 655-4482 (302) 295-2000 III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant) (For Diversity Cases Only) DEF PTF DEF ☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question PTF Citizen of This State ПіПі Incorporated or Principal Place □4 □4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business in This State 2 U.S. Government ■ 4 DIVERSITY Incorporated and Principal Place □ 5
□ 5 Citizen of Another State □ 2 □ 2 (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) Defendant of Business in Another State Citizen or Subject of a □ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation □ 6 □ 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ⊠ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug ☐ 423 Withdrawal ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury-28 USC 157 ☐ 625 Drug Related Seiznre 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 130 Miller Act Med Malpractice ☐ 315 Airplane Product of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 365 Personal Injury-☐ 630 Liquor Laws Product Liability ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck ■ 820 Copyrights & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Slander ☐ 650 Airline Regs ☐ 830 Patent Injury Product Liability ☐ 151 Medicare Act Corrupt Organizations ☐ 330 Federal Employers ☐ 840 Trademark Liability ☐ 660 Occupational ☐ 480 Consumer Credit □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Safety/Health Student Loans ☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY ■ 810 Selective Service (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 690 Other ☐ 345 Marine Product ■ 850 Securities/Commodities/ ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits Liability SOCIAL SECURITY LABOR Exchange ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle 875 Customer Challenge ☐ 710 Fair Lahor Standards □ 861 HJA (1395fD ☐ 380 Other Personal ☐ 160 Stockholders' Snits ☐ 355 Motor Vahicle 12 USC 3410 Property Damage 190 Other Contract ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) 891 Agricultural Acts Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmr. Relations ■ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act Product Liability ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI Injury ☐ 196 Franchise ■ 893 Environmental Matters &Disclosure Act ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) ■ 894 Energy Allocation Act REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation Act 441 Votine 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. or Defendant) ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 220 Foreclosnre Under Equal Access 443 Honsing/ Accommodations 871 (RS - Third Party □ 230 Reni Lease & Ejectment Habeas Corpus: to Justice 26 USC 7609 ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 950 Constitutionality of ☐ 530 General 444 Welfare State Statutes 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 535 Death Penalty 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -290 All Other Real Property ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 7 Appeal to District □ 3 TI 5 \Box 1 **2** 2 Transferred from Multidistrict Removed from Remanded from Reinstated or Judge from Original another district Litigation Magistrate Appellate Court Reopened Proceeding State Court (specify) Judgment (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): VI. CAUSE OF ACTION 28 U.S.C. § 1332 Brief description of cause: Property damage claim arising from a fire ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION **DEMAND \$ in excess of \$204,320.54** Cheek YES only if demanded in complaint: VII. REQUESTED IN UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: ✓ YES □ NO COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASES(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER IF ANY SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD DATE July 11, 2007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY APPLYING IFP JUDGE

AO FORM 8	S RECEPT	(REV. 9/04	١
TO LOIGHT U	O INCOME	(1,000)	,

United States District Court for the District of Delaware

07-431

Civil Action No.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT FOR AO FORM 85

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION

I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE REC	CEIPT OF COPIES OF AO FORM 85.
(Date forms issued)	(Signature of Party or their Representative)
	(Printed name of Party or their Representative)
	•

Note: Completed receipt will be filed in the Civil Action